



| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Agenda Item #: | 3 |
| Project Title: | 3100 E Washington Avenue - New Multi-Family Building in Urban Design District (UDD) 5. (District 12) |
| Legistar File ID #: | 77926 |
| Members Present: | Cliff Goodhart, Chair; Jessica Klehr, Shane Bernau, Christian Harper, Marsha Rummel, Rafeeq Asad, and Wendy von Below |
| Prepared By: | Jessica Vaughn, AICP, UDC Secretary |

Summary

At its meeting of November 29, 2023, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** of a new multi-family building located at 3100 E Washington Avenue. Registered and speaking in support were Nick Orthmann, Felipe Ornelas, and Adam Templer. Registered in support and available to answer questions were Kevin Yeska, and Rachel Foley. Registered and speaking in opposition were Dave Halberslaben, Les Orosz, and William Lynch. Registered and speaking neither in support nor opposition was Alder Latimer Burris.

The applicant team presented the updated plans and changes that have been incorporated to address the UDC's conditions of approval relating to the Initial Approval of the project, including:

- Providing a final materials board,
- Clarifying that the face of the entry ramp along Washington is going to be a rubbed concrete finish,
- Adding additional fenestration in the community lounge area,
- Clarifying the details that are being used to transition between materials and different exterior elements. A few different techniques were used to add articulation, including an offset where masonry meets cement board; details were also provided of the parapet details to show the finish at the top of the building; there is also a detail of how the blue awning protrudes from the building to add dimension; and the last detail shown is intended to show the aluminum J panel between cement board and lap siding.
- Renderings of the cube have been provided,
- With regard to the site plan the circulation has been changed to reflect a full loop versus a dead-end in the parking area,
- Clarifying that there will be a six-foot tall privacy fence separating the site from the neighbor on Melvin court,
- A truck turning diagram was submitted related to site circulation,
- The demolition plan was updated to show that the existing fence is being fully removed and being replaced with a new one,
- The landscape plan has been updated to show the proposed fence and replacement arborvitae along the shared property line with the neighbor on Melvin Court, and
- The lighting plan has been updated to reflect the current site plan.

Alder Latimer Burris noted that she had sent in commentary for the meeting that was held on November 9, which was attended by 30 people. It was the first community meeting that was held for various reasons, which are water under the bridge. Just to double back, but not to repeat some of the previous comments, the major concerns are the parking, the site access and traffic on Melvin Court versus East Washington Avenue, the challenges with additional demand for on-street parking in the neighborhood, some of the off shadowing and shadowing the back of the neighborhood with heights, and also comments were received with regard to the concern about affordable housing, and what kind of offset

services there going to be available to the residents. Having lived through Rethke, it has gotten to a point where it has been turned around, but there are several residents that are challenged with having to do this repeatedly, what is the management plan for this development? I don't want to go over the summary, which was about 5-6 different items that were captured. I had the meeting transcribed if anyone is interested in getting the full transcript from me. That is about it.

The Commission had the following questions for staff and the development team:

- As a Commission our ability is limited to the seven design related items that came back from the Plan Commission. We cannot look back at other fundamental design elements as it is already approved. Essentially we are here to determine whether the items the developer spoke of have been met. It is not under our purview to look at the other concerns the neighbors may have. I don't know where the disconnect is; we started looking at this way back in May. I do not know why there is a disconnect.
- On the plans, there is a nice section showing the north-south elevation and the difference in elevation between E Washington and the building. In the renderings, are we seeing the true base of the building, are there any materials that we're missing or any sections of building that we're not seeing because of the grade change? I think the grade change does come up to the building, but wanted to confirm that.
 - The renderings accurately depict what the building will look like, there are a few areas of exposed basement, primarily along the ramp area along E Washington Avenue and in a few spots wrapping back along that same area where it wraps into the parking lot. In all other locations the grading will go up to the first floor. The renderings are accurate.
 - That's correct, the grading comes up to a few inches below the first floor around most of the building. At the ramp area at the corner of Melvin Court and E Washington there is a 3.5' exposure to provide the ADA access at the front and back, and the stairs up to that point.

The Commission discussed the following:

- I will not be voting for this proposal. I am struggling with the environmental justice implications of this site being within the 65 decibel day and night average sound level from the airport. By the FAA determination 65 decibels is where compatibility issues may be with residential, and several of the speakers talked about how it is not just 65 decibels but they have had readings of up to 115 and 120 decibels. I think this is a land use compatibility issue because it is a public health issue. I know we need more housing, especially affordable housing, and while the developer can insulate the building, they cannot mitigate the noise exposure when you open the windows or go outside. Noise at these levels have been shown to be detrimental to human health. So, I do not think this meets the public interest.
- (Alder Latimer Burris) So, again, the issue of parking; just want to highlight that. I know that they want the developers wanted to focus around bikes and transit overlay district and BRT, it is asking a lot of the neighborhood. I know that this doesn't even have to go to the neighborhood, but I think that is not a good thing. We are doing all these project all over we have to take into consideration design and how it integrates in with the neighborhood. For the record, it is all in the letter that you received.
- To clarify, I just wanted to note that the adequacy of parking is not one of the criteria that is open to us to review at this point in the process.
- I'd like to point out, I don't want the neighbors to presume we are not concerned with parking issues, it comes up all the time. We're certainly aware of it and the potential implications on surrounding neighborhoods. We are sympathetic to it but as the Chair has pointed out, at this part of the process changes of that level are beyond what we can do at this point. We have concerns with parking all the time on projects, we share your concerns and hope for the best with adjustments to the design of the streets and intersections around there. Sometimes changes are made and problems get really out of hand, we will hope for the best in this situation. There have been other ones in the past that people predicted dire consequences; they've turned out not nearly as bad and I would hope that ends up being the case here. Also, I share the concern about the noise levels with

the jets. I've lived on the other side of the airport for a very long time; it is a concern, that map of the 65 decibel level, this project is literally sitting right on the edge of it. To say we can't have housing here sort of flies in the face of the fact that there's an existing neighborhood and apartments even closer to the airport than this. It seems strange to think that you can't build any housing here, especially on the edges; is it ideal? Of course not. But these neighborhoods existed there for a long time and the idea that we're banning any future housing in these areas doesn't seem realistic.

- (Alder Latimer Burris) These projects are going up really fast, they'd love to blame the Alder that we do not do anything. It's the direction the City wants to go. When the neighborhood was developed F35s were not here. There is not a chance that they come in at 65 decibels. The City is going to have to address this with the developers in the future but to disregard that the neighborhood has changed since they have arrived. I am not surveying the neighborhood, most people were not aware of what it would do to their lives. I know this is not the place for the commentary.
- Just to reiterate, concerns noted about parking and those that the Alder raised are very important, we are just not in the position this evening to impose additional conditions outside of the eight that are being reviewed on this action item.

Action

On a motion by von Below, seconded by Knudson, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED FINAL APPROVAL** with the findings that all of the Initial Approval conditions have been met. The motion was passed on a vote of (5-2-1) with Knudson, von Below, Harper, Asad, and Bernau voting yes; Rummel and Klehr voting no; and Chair Goodhart non-voting.